



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,487	12/19/2005	Dennis Drayna	4239-66168-03	2289
36218	7590	04/04/2008	EXAMINER	
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP 121 S.W. SALMON STREET SUITE #1600 PORTLAND, OR 97204-2988				WEGERT, SANDRA L
1647		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
04/04/2008		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
				PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/561,487	DRAYNA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SANDRA WEGERT	1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-28,30,32-41,43-48,50 and 51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-28, 30, 32-41, 43-48, 50 and 51 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in response to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

- I. Claims 1-16, 20-25, 43 and 44, drawn to T2R variant-specific nucleic acid molecules and kits comprising.
- II. Claims 17-19, 45 and 46, drawn to T2R polypeptide fragments and epitopes, classified in class 530, subclass 300+.
- III. Claims 26-28, 30, 32 and 33, drawn to a method of screening compounds useful for modulating taste, by measuring nucleic acid expression.
- IV. Claim 34-36, 47, 48, 50 and 51, drawn to an in vivo method of screening compounds useful for modulating taste, by measuring binding to or activity of a T2R taste receptor.
- V. Claims 37 and 38, drawn to a ligand that binds specifically to a T2R taste receptor.
- VI. Claims 39-41, drawn to a method of determining a T2R genotype for a subject or a plurality of subjects.

Secondary Election

Furthermore, applicant is required to elect *one* T2R sequence for prosecution, keeping in mind that the novelty of that elected sequence will confer novelty on the array comprising that sequence.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The first claimed invention lacks a special technical feature because it fails to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art (Ueda, T. et al, 2001, Biochem. Biophys. Res. Comm., 285: 147-151, of record 24 August 2006). The prior art discloses T2R receptor polynucleotides that meet the limitations of a T2R receptor comprising at least 10 nucleotides and spanning a SNP (See, for example, the Abstract). Therefore, none of the other claimed inventions can share a special technical feature with the first claimed invention.

In addition, the nucleic acids, polypeptides and ligands comprising or used in the methods of Groups I-VI are all structurally and functionally different chemical compounds, each of which can be made and used without the other compounds. Likewise, the methods of making the proteins, detecting the proteins and detecting ligands each require administration or use of different compounds which are structurally and functionally different from each other and each of which can be made and used without the other. Lack of unity is shown because these compounds and methods lack a common utility which is based upon a common structural feature which has been identified as the basis for that common utility.

Furthermore, the sequences listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the sequences lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each is a unique fragment of T2R with different transduction properties and comprising a different SNP.

In response to this Office Action/Election requirement, applicants must elect from Groups I-VII, and must elect a fragment T2R. Applicant is advised that in order for the reply to this requirement to be complete it must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 C.F.R. 1.143). The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected invention, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Rejoinder under Ochiai/Brouwer

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection

are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined.

See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Advisory information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sandra Wegert whose telephone number is (571) 272-0895. The examiner can normally be reached Monday - Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM (Eastern Time). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Manjunath Rao, can be reached at (571) 272-0939.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (in USA or CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/SLW/

30 April 2007

/Manjunath N. Rao, /

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1647